

RESPONSE AND REMARKS

SPECIFICATION

In the Office action, the Examiner objected to use of various trademarks as used in the specification and indicated that the trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear. Responsive to the Examiner's objections to the use of trademarks, further amendments to the specification are submitted herewith. The further amendments to the specification identify trademarks used in the specification, reference the proprietary nature of those trademarks through the use of the "TM" symbol, and equate the TM-designated trademark with both an all-capitalized version of the trademark and with alternative ways in which the trademarks appear in the specification.

SECTION 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner renewed the previous rejection of the claims, rejecting Claims 1-27 and 49-58 under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,369; "Nicholls") in view of Fisher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,264; "Fisher") and Kara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,568; "Kara"); the Examiner renewed the rejection of Claims 28-48 under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholls in view of Pauly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,280; "Pauly") and Kara.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected previous arguments that the claims of the present application are patentably distinct from the cited references because they are directed to a simultaneous identification of, a display of, or a calculation of charges by, respective carriers that would provide delivery notification services. The Examiner rejected those arguments, finding that ". . . the word simultaneous is not claimed . . . this limitation only comes into the claims in the newly presented claim 58."

In addition to Claim 58, it is respectfully submitted that the word "simultaneous" is explicitly claimed in independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 35, 42, 49, 52, and 55. For example, Claims 1, 10 and 19 were amended to recite ". . . **simultaneous** identification of each carrier of a plurality of carriers that would

provide electronic mail delivery notification for shipping the respective particular parcel. . .".

Further, although the word "simultaneous" is not expressly recited in the other independent claims (e.g., Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, 26, 34, 41, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, and 57), it is respectfully submitted that the other independent Claims are directed to an identification, calculation, or display, as the case may be, of charges or services where the identification, calculation or display, as the case may be, is substantially simultaneous in nature.

As compared to the combination of the references cited by the Examiner, the amended claims (as previously presented) are directed to a simultaneous (either expressly simultaneous, or substantially simultaneous in nature) identification of, a display of, or a calculation of delivery notification or service options and/or charges for such option, by, respective carriers that would provide delivery notification services or other service options.

It is respectfully submitted that the Claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, alone or in combination because none of the cited references disclose, anticipate, or suggest, alone or in combination with any other cited reference, the subject matter of the amended claims of the present application that are directed to a simultaneous, or substantially simultaneous in nature, identification of, a display of, or a calculation or identification of charges and/or services by, respective carriers of a plurality of carriers that would provide delivery notification services or other service options, wherein the respective simultaneous, or substantially simultaneous in nature, identification, display or the calculation or identification is responsive to a request by a respective user of a plurality of users and is communicated to the respective user via a global communications network, such as the Internet.

For the foregoing reasons and for the reasons previously given, because independent Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 28, 34, 35, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50, and 51 through 58 are patentable over the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2 through 6, 9, 11 through 15, 18, 20 through

Application Serial No. 09/685,078
Amendment and Response After Final Rejection

24, 27, 29 through 33, 36 through 40, and 43 through 47, are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing reasons and for the reasons previously given, it is respectfully submitted that the invention disclosed and claimed in the present amended application is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By 

Marilyn R. Khorsandi
Reg. No. 45,744
626/796-2856